

From Intellectual Cooperation to International Cultural Exchange: Japan and China in the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation

Takashi Saikawa

Abstract

This article explores the paradigm shift in the idea of international cultural exchange in the interwar period, mainly focusing on the discourse in the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations. It shows that the ICIC, initially established as a universal community of intellectuals sharing values of Western civilization, confronted challenges from Japan and China emphasizing the role of governments and the significance of national cultures. As a result, the ICIC moved away from the universalism of Western civilization and came to seek a close cooperation with governments and to underscore the particularity of national cultures in its ideas and programs. The article argues that this paradigm shift from universality to particularity of culture, from intellectual cooperation to international cultural exchange, was brought about by Asian countries such as Japan and China, and accordingly that the idea of international cultural exchange can be regarded as a globalized and transcultural product which emerged from the web of interactions between the ICIC on one hand and Japan and China on the other, as well as between Europe and Asia.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this essay is to explore the globalized and trans-cultural flow of ideas related to international cultural exchange between Europe and Asia during the interwar period. The main focus of this essay is on the ideas and activities of the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation (ICIC),¹ that was established in 1922 as a technical organization of the League of Nations aiming to facilitate international understanding. It can be assumed that the ICIC, called the “League of Cultures,” functioned as the global basis of the foundation of national organizations for international cultural exchange in major countries such as Germany (the Goethe Institute in 1933), Great Britain (the British Council in 1934), and Japan (The Center for International Cultural Relations in 1934).² Starting with the question of why these national organizations for international cultural exchange came simultaneously into existence, this essay examines the transformation of the discourse on international cultural exchange in the ICIC. In particular, it shows empirically that the fundamental principles of the ICIC which were initially based on monism of Western civilization, underwent a gradual transformation into cultural relativism based on the particularity of national cultures.

At the same time, this essay examines the role of China and Japan in this paradigm shift in the ICIC discourse. Both Asian countries revolted against the Euro-centric view of connecting the idea of civilization with nationalism.³ Transcending the Euro-centric view of international cultural exchange, which pervaded the literature on the topic during that period,⁴ this study analyzes the resistance to and adoption of cultural practices of the ICIC from the non-Western nations in East Asia. China and Japan were not only the most ardent advocates for the ICIC in the non-Western world but also the most outspoken critics of the Euro-centrism of allegedly universal organizations such as the League of Nations, which was in truth the embodiment of a diffuse

internationalism of Western civilization.⁵ Refuting this monism, both China and Japan asserted the plurality of world civilizations, while paradoxically arguing for the centrality of Asian civilization. These two Asian countries underscored the representativeness and the respective superiority of their national cultures within Asian civilization. As a result, this symbiosis of civilization with nationalism contributed to the formation of the modern conception of international cultural exchange, based on the particularity of national culture, implemented by nation states and aimed at fostering national interests. Thus, this essay demonstrates that the idea of international cultural exchange itself can be regarded as a globalized and trans-cultural product which emerged from the web of interactions between the ICIC on one hand and Japan and China on the other, as well as between Europe and Asia.

2. Establishment of the ICIC

It was in 1922 that the Council of the League of Nations founded the ICIC as its consultative organization. At the first plenary session of the ICIC in August 1922, Nitobe Inazo, Under-secretary General in charge of intellectual cooperation,⁶ made an opening address, in which he defined the characteristics of the ICIC.

The members of the Committee were all personalities eminent in the various branches of human knowledge, and their relations with their respective Governments, which they in no ways represented, were those of complete independence.

The work of the Committee, the scope of which had not been strictly defined, either by the Council or by the Assembly, was to submit to the Assembly a report on the step to be taken by the League to facilitate intellectual relations between peoples, particularly in respect of the communication of scientific information.⁷

According to Nitobe, at least two characteristics of the ICIC can be identified. The first one is “non-governmentality”. In principle, the members of the ICIC should be elected not as a government representative but as a representative of various academic fields. In other words, the important thing for the members is not their nationality but their academic achievements. In this way, the ICIC laid great stress on the role of individuals, while the League of Nations itself was an intergovernmental organization. The second characteristic is its emphasis on “universality” of culture. Whereas Nitobe stressed the communication of scientific information, fundamental principles of the early ICIC were based on “universal culture” shared by all intellectuals such as “science” and “objectivity”.⁸ Thus, it can be said that the “intellectual cooperation” in the early ICIC meant the intercourse and solidarity among intellectuals based on the universality of culture. In fact, just as nationality was ignored in the election of the members, the ICIC in the early years gave little consideration to the particularity of national cultures.

However, Nitobe as the chief secretary of the ICIC was fully aware that a number of governments were attempting to influence this new project called “intellectual cooperation” in different ways, and that it was hard to ignore problems concerning nationality. After the first plenary session of the ICIC, Nitobe submitted a report on the establishment of the ICIC, in which he mentioned this problem.

In the nomination of the members, nationality was to be ignored in principle, and only the personal merits of individual candidates were to count. Such an ideal principle of appointment was hard to follow. Practically all the nationalities composing the Council were represented in the Committee, except Japan and China. Why these exceptions?

As to China, because her universities are yet so little developed; as to Japan, it was first planned (in my private discussion with M. Lafontaine and Professor Gilbert Murray who took the most active part in the question in the Assembly) to make the Committee as small as possible - five or seven members - and it was thought that the presence of a Japanese (myself) in the capacity of secretary, would actually though not officially represent the Far East; but finally the full member of twelve was appointed, and I thought that Asia should have a better representation.⁹

Here Nitobe admitted that intense pressure from governments made the ICIC unable to carry out the principle of ignorance of nationality. Nonetheless, as he reported, Japan and China were not represented as members of the ICIC.¹⁰ Like Nitobe, both the Japanese and Chinese governments intensified the feeling that “Asia” should be represented in the ICIC since the “universality” of the ICIC was based on the Euro-centric view on culture. Thus, both governments started to get involved in the ICIC, revolting against its “universalism”.

3. Challenges from Asia: China¹¹

China was the first challenger to the universalism of the ICIC. China's commitment to the ICIC coincided with its active campaign for a non-permanent seat of the Council. Although China, the Beiyang Government of the Republic of China at that time, successfully gained the non-permanent seat at the election in the first assembly of the League in 1920, its position was in flux, since non-permanent members were supposed to be replaced every few years. In order to perpetuate China's position as a non-permanent member, the Chinese delegates led by Wellington Koo were incessantly engaged in an exploitation campaign on the occasion of the election.¹² In this campaign, China asserted Fenzhou Zhuyi, a principle that the non-permanent seats of the Council of the League of Nations should be distributed according to cultural diversity as well as geographic location.¹³ Emphasizing the geographical and cultural importance of Asia in the world, China asked for the distribution of non-permanent seats on the basis of a sort of “cultural relativism.” However, it must be noted that China implied behind this logic of “cultural relativism” its consciousness of great nation, its national identity as a representative of Asia.¹⁴

In the same way, China had shown its keen interest in the ICIC since the early stage of the establishment of the ICIC. For example, at the 4th Assembly of the League of Nations in 1923, China with confidence insisted on the importance of Asia in the project of the ICIC, calling for the nomination of a Chinese intellectual as a member of the ICIC.

[T]he intellectual movement in the Far East was not adequately represented on the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation. The culture of China was one of the oldest, and...it would be advisable for the Committee to include a specialist on Far-Eastern questions. The exchange of professors and students between the West and the Far East should certainly become more frequent. Intellectual exchange would bring about a better understanding between nations.¹⁵

China subsequently proposed a draft resolution that the membership of the ICIC should be extended to cover the field of the ancient studies in Asiatic countries.¹⁶ Though China herewith aimed to achieve the nomination of a Chinese member in the ICIC, it eventually failed to obtain broad support from other countries.¹⁷

A Chinese delegate bitterly complained about the lack of a Chinese member in the composition of the ICIC, criticizing India that already had a membership in the ICIC.¹⁸ In short, from the

standpoint of China, Asia was not appreciated until China occupied a position of a member in the ICIC. Insisting on the cultural importance of Asia, China proposed a sort of international “cultural relativism,” which forced the ICIC to modify the idea of intellectual cooperation based on the universality of culture.

4. Challenges from Asia: Japan¹⁹

To be sure, the Japanese government sent Nitobe to the ICIC virtually as the Japanese representative. However, this is not to say that Japan had been actively involved in the programs of the ICIC. In fact, the Japanese government paid little attention to the ICIC in its early years. It was at the time of Nitobe’s resignation from the League in 1926 that the Japanese government launched cooperation with the ICIC.

In 1926, Gakugei Kyōryoku Iinkai (the National Committee of Japan on Intellectual Cooperation) was established.²⁰ Although this committee was established as a private organization, the Japanese government, in particular the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, had continually taken the initiative in the process of its formation. This involvement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was evident not only in the constitution of the Japanese national committee but also in the financial sources of the committee. In fact, because the committee was funded by the ministry, all members were selected by the ministry during the funding period. Consequently, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had a great influence on the Japanese national committee in terms of both the process of its formation and the financial resources. Nonetheless, it should be noted that the committee was eventually inaugurated not as a subordinate organ of the ministry but as a private organization belonging to the Japan Association for the League of Nations.²¹ For this reason, the committee was called a “bastard child of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.”²²

This national committee implemented various cultural exchange programs, such as the translation of Japanese commercial law and civil law into English, the publication of the yearbook of Japanese art, and the introduction of Japanese literary classics. To be sure, the committee was originally established as a national organization of the ICIC, but in the process of its formation, its main purpose came to be defined not as one of corresponding and cooperating with the ICIC but as one of introducing Japanese culture to the West. To illustrate, a pamphlet prepared by the national committee, its main aim was stated as follows:

*The primary purpose of our committee is to introduce Japanese culture. In terms of international cooperation, it must be an urgent task to show the true nature of Oriental culture to Western people who often know very little about it.*²³

With this in mind, the most crucial task of the committee was to introduce Japanese culture overseas, especially to Western countries.²⁴ As with China, it can be argued that by Japan identifying herself as a representative of Asia, she challenged the universalism espoused by the Eurocentric members of the ICIC by emphasizing the particularity of national cultures. It should be noted that there were incompatible views between China and Japan on the status of the representative of Asia. Notwithstanding, China and Japan worked in concert to revolt against the universalistic nature of the ICIC. In fact, Japan consistently advocated the “cultural relativism” asserted by China in the League, and vice versa.²⁵

5. ICIC toward Asia

As a consequence of the above-mentioned challenges from China and Japan, the idea of the ICIC eventually shifted from universality to particularity. At the same time, the involvement of governments, which was prudently excluded at first, came to be embraced by the ICIC. The changes that occurred in the ICIC can be demonstrated by two projects: the Mission of Educational Experts to China and the Japanese Collection.

The project of the Mission of Educational Experts to China was initiated at the request of the Nationalist Chinese Government in Nanjing to cooperate with the League of Nations on April 25, 1931. The Nationalist Government, inheriting the basic understanding on the ICIC from the Beiyang Government, not only succeeded in the nomination of Wu Zhi-Hui as a first Chinese member of the ICIC²⁶ but also aimed to promote further cooperation with the League of Nations. This request was part of the “Technical Cooperation” implemented between China and the League in the 1930s and meant that the Chinese commission of the ICIC was to investigate the situation of education in China and submit the report on the reform of Chinese educational system. Soon after receiving the request, the ICIC organized and dispatched the mission to China in September 1931.²⁷ This project was the first experience for the ICIC to assist a particular government.²⁸ Hitherto, the ICIC’s fundamental principle was defined in non-governmental terms in its early years; however it came to develop cooperative relations with governments.

In 1932 the mission published its report in which the intention of the ICIC to cooperate with China was manifested as follows:

*The educational system of a country is one of the strongest bounds of national unity. In China this fact has always been acknowledged, but the recent development under a variety of foreign influences has severely endangered the unity of the national culture. The starting-point of our proposal is the desire to re-establish this unity under the altered conditions of modern China, and to emphasise the national and social character of her educational system.*²⁹

Here, it can be found that the ICIC had an intense interest in the national unity of China, especially Chinese national culture. In this respect, the ICIC suggested that China under the influence of foreign cultures should reconstruct and preserve the national genius of China and the particularity of its national culture. Thus, the ICIC intended to engage in the construction of national values as well as lay emphasis on the particularity of national culture. In other words, the Mission of Educational Experts to China can be regarded as the ICIC’s attempt to construct China’s national culture from the outside.

Adopting the similar approach toward Japan, the ICIC started the publication of the Japanese Collection in 1935. This project, originally advocated by the Kokusai Bunka Shinkōkai (The Center for International Cultural Relation of Japan), was approved at the plenary session of the ICIC in 1935.³⁰ With financial support by the Japanese government, the ICIC intended to introduce Japanese culture to Western countries by translating Japanese classics into French. The Japanese Collection had two primary objectives, first, “to make a civilization better known in its past, and also in its more recent developments,” and second, “to render accessible to a wide public the masterpieces of Japanese thought, notably those which have contributed most largely to the molding of the national mentality and which are a characteristic expression of the culture of a people.”³¹ Based on these principles, the ICIC published three volumes as the Japan Collection.³²

The most significant aspect about the Japanese Collection is that the ICIC started the pro-

gram to introduce Japanese culture to Western countries, which was initially implemented by the National Committee of Japan. In so doing, the ICIC underscored the significance of the particularity of national culture, such as “the moulding of national mentality” and “a characteristic expression of the culture,” and subsequently this attitude was expanded to the general pattern of the ICIC with respect to national cultures.³³ It can be said that the ICIC purposefully facilitated the construction of Japanese national culture from the outside, as with the case of the Mission of Educational Experts to China regarding Chinese national culture. The reason for these efforts is that the ICIC at this point thought of mutual understanding and exchange of “particular” national cultures as the essence of intellectual cooperation.

6. Conclusion

The idea of intellectual cooperation in the ICIC was dramatically transformed through the confrontational commitment of China and Japan. Two main conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of these two Asian countries’ stance.

First, though the ICIC paid little attention to the roles of governments and the values of national cultures in its early years, in accordance with the challenges of China and Japan, it came to seek a close partnership with governments, supporting the construction of their national cultures from the outside. Again, the idea of intellectual cooperation shifted from universality to particularity of culture. For instance, at the 20th plenary session of the ICIC in 1938, G. de Reynold, who had been a member of the ICIC since its establishment, summarized the principles of intellectual cooperation.

- (1) Our organization has been established to serve intellectual life.
- (2) Establishment of our organization on solid national basis.
- (3) To respect the diversity and originality of all forms of culture and all aspects of civilizations.
- (4) Universality.³⁴

Compared with the statement by Nitobe in 1922, it can be argued that the ICIC moved away from the universality of culture that emphasized roles of individual intellectuals and was finally settled into particularity of culture based on national cultures. The ICIC was no longer a universal intellectual community but a “League of Cultures,” an organization among national cultures. In this sense, the ICIC as a “League of Cultures” provided the international basis of national organizations for international cultural organization, which were simultaneously founded in various countries in the 1930s.

Second, this paradigm shift of the ICIC resulted from the challenges of Japan and China. As previously stated, both of the governments revolted against the universalism of the ICIC with great emphasis on the particularity of each national culture. This antagonism should be regarded as a stinging criticism against the Euro-centric view on which the universalism of the ICIC was based. It can be concluded that China and Japan contributed to the shift of the idea of intellectual cooperation in the interwar period, and to the formation of the idea on international cultural exchange, one that international cultural exchange should be implemented by nation-states and primarily based on the idea of national culture.

Notes

- ¹ The ICIC, boasting famous intellectuals such as Henri Bergson, Marie Curie, Albert Einstein, Thomas Mann, and Paul Valéry, was the most representative international organization for international cultural exchange in the interwar years. In the postwar period, most of those ideas and programs have been taken over by UNESCO. On overview of the history of the ICIC, see : Jean-Jacques Renoliet, *L'UNESCO oubliée: La Société des Nations et la coopération intellectuelle (1919-1946)* (UNESCO Forgetting: The League of Nations and intellectual cooperation [1919-1946]), Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1999; Pham-Thi-Tu, *La coopération intellectuelle sous la Société des Nations*, (Intellectual cooperation under the League of Nations), Paris: Librairie Minard, 1960; Jan Kolasa, "A League of Minds: The International Intellectual Cooperation Organization of the League of Nations" Ph. D. Thesis, Princeton University, 1960.
- ² In the sense that nation states came to play a predominant role in the realm of cultural exchange, Ken-ichiro Hirano characterizes this period as an era of cultural exchange implemented by nation states. Kenichiro Hirano, "Kokusai Kankei ni okeru Bunka Kōryū: Shiteki Kōsatsu" (Cultural exchange in international relations: A historical overview), in Makoto Saito et al., *Kokusai Kankei ni okeru Bunka Kōryū* (Cultural exchange in international relations), Tokyo: The Japan Institute of International Affairs, 1984, pp.10-17.
- ³ On the close relationship between the idea of civilization and nationalism in interwar Asia, see Prasenjit Duara, "The Discourse of Civilization and Pan-Asianism," *Journal of World History*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 99-130; Prasenjit Duara, *Sovereignty and Authenticity: Manchukuo and the East Asian Modern*, New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2004, pp. 89-129. In addition, persuasive research has recently been done on the conceptual change of civilization. See Bruce Mazlish, *Civilization and Its Content*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- ⁴ In general, international cultural exchange is perceived as an inherently positive ideology. For example, see Akira Iriye, *Cultural Internationalism and World Order*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997. Iriye argues the significance of international cultural exchange from the point view of international peace, and calls the idea and implementation of international cultural exchange as "cultural internationalism." According to Iriye, although "cultural internationalism" was defeated by fascism in the 1930s, it survived and flourished after World War II. However, if international cultural exchange has shared the same ideological background with nationalism, it cannot be assumed that the idea of international cultural exchange such as "cultural internationalism" was in direct opposition to fascism, which is, needless to say, closely related with nationalism. It seems that this problem in Iriye's argument results from his Euro-centric view on international cultural exchange.
- ⁵ Despite the significance of their roles, remarkably little historical research has been conducted on Japan and China in the ICIC. Nonetheless, some studies on Japanese and Chinese diplomatic histories have given suggestive explanations for this. As for Japan, see: Thomas W. Burkman, *Japan and the League of Nations: Empire and World Order, 1914-1938*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007; Yoshiro Unno, *Kokusai Renmei to Nihon* (The League of Nations and Japan), Tokyo: Hara Shobo, 1972; Naotake Sato, ed., *Kokusai Renmei ni okeru Nihon* (Japan in the League of Nations), Tokyo: Kajima Heiwa Kenkyūjo, 1972. As for China, see: Chi-Hua Tang, *Beijing Zhengfu yu Guoji Lianmeng (1919-1928)* (The Beijing Government and the League of Nations, 1919-1928), Taipei: Dongda Tushu, 1998; Li Zhang, *Guoji Hezuo zai Zhongguo: Guoji Lianmeng Jiaose de Kaocha, 1919-1946* (International cooperation in China, with special consideration to its relation with the League of Nations), Taipei: Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinica, 1999; Lau-King Quan, *China's Relations with the League of Nations, 1919-1936*, Hong Kong: the Asiatic Litho. Printing Press, 1939.
- ⁶ On Nitobe's key role in the foundation of the ICIC, see Izumi Hirobe, "Kokusai Renmei Chiteki Kyōryoku linkai no Sōsetsu to Nitobe Inazo" (The formation of the League of Nations International Committee of Intellectual Cooperation and Nitobe Inazo), *Hokkaido Daigaku Bungaku Kenkyūka Kiyō* (The Annual Report on Cultural Science), Vol. 121 (2007), pp. 1-20.
- ⁷ League of Nations, Committee on Intellectual Cooperation, *Minutes of the First Session, Geneva, August 1st-5th, 1922*, Geneva, 1922, p. 3.
- ⁸ For this reason, programs of the early ICIC were mainly focusing on natural science.
- ⁹ Inazo Nitobe, "Observation of the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation," Geneva, August 18, 1922.

- ¹⁰ League of Nations, "Nomination of a Committee on Intellectual Cooperation, Memorandum by the Secretary-General," Geneva, March 16, 1922. Though two Japanese intellectuals, Sakurai Joji and Tanakadate Aikitsu, were considered as candidates for ICIC membership, neither of them could be appointed. No Chinese name was listed even as a candidate.
- ¹¹ For details, see Takashi Saikawa, "Kokusai Renmei Chiteki Kyōryoku Kokusai Iinkai to Chūgoku" (China's challenge to the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation: Transformation of the idea of international culture in the interwar period), *Waseda Seiji Kōhō Kenkyū* (The Waseda Study of Politics and Public Law), No. 85 (2007), pp. 211-245.
- ¹² As a result, the Beiyang Government of China had successfully occupied the non-permanent seat from 1920 to 1923 and from 1926 to 1928. On China's campaign for a non-permanent seat in the Council of the League of Nations, see Chi-hua Tang, *Beijing Zhengfu yu Guoji Lianmeng*, Ch.3.
- ¹³ It was at the 3rd Assembly of the League of Nations in 1922 that Chinese delegates first suggested this principle. League of Nations, *Records of the Third Assembly, Plenary Meetings, Vol. 1, Text of the Debates* (Meeting held from September 4th to 30th, 1922), Geneva, 1922, pp. 345-346.
- ¹⁴ According to Shin Kawashima, China has consistently sought to enhance its international status on its diplomacy since the 2nd Hague Peace conference in 1907, emphasizing its self-image as a great nation. See Shin Kawashima, "Chūgoku Gaikō ni okeru Shōchō toshiteno Kokusaiteki Chii" (The long-term target on Chinese diplomatic history to enhance its international status on the Hague Peace Conference, the League of Nations, and the United Nations), *Kokusai Seiji* (International Relations), Vol. 145 (2006), pp. 17-35.
- ¹⁵ League of Nations, *Records of the Fourth Assembly, Text of the Debates*, Geneva, 1923, p. 24.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 34.
- ¹⁷ Gilbert Murray, the vice-chairman of the ICIC and a delegate of South Africa at the same time, was also reluctant to approve the Chinese resolution, while acknowledging the significance of Chinese culture. According to Murray, in order to reflect various national cultures, the ICIC would have to appoint as many members as the Assembly, which was impossible (*Ibid.*, p. 34).
- ¹⁸ League of Nations, *Records of the Fourth Assembly, Meeting of the Committees, Minutes of the Fourth Committee (Social and General Questions)*, Geneva, 1923, p. 56.
- ¹⁹ For details, see Takashi Saikawa, "Kokusai Bunka Kōryū no Nashonarizumu" (Nationalism of international cultural exchange: the case of Japan's intellectual cooperation with the League of Nations), *Jiseidai Ajia Ronshū* (Journal of next generation Asia forum), No. 1 (2008), pp. 11-30.
- ²⁰ The committee members included: Yamada Saburo (Chairman), Anesaki Masaharu, Miyajima Mikinosuke, Komura Kinichi, Nagaoka Harukazu, and Awaya Ken.
- ²¹ More precisely, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs transferred the Japanese national committee to the Japan Association of the League of Nations in 1927. It is still a moot point whether or not the ministry intended to hide its strong influence on the national committee. At the same time, it can be argued that the ministry took careful note of the nature of the ICIC, "non-governmentality". On the Japan Association of the League of Nations, see Iwamoto Shōkō, "Nihon Kokusai Renmei Kyōkai: 30 nendai ni okeru Kokusai Kyōchō Shugi no Tenkai" (Japan Association for the League of Nations: The development of internationalism in the 1930s), *Ritsumeikan Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo Kiyō* (Memoirs of Institute of Humanities, Human and Social Sciences, Ritsumeikan University), No. 85 (2005), pp. 115-147; Ikei Masaru, "Nihon Kokusai Renmei Kyōkai: Sono Seiritsu to Henshitsu" (Japan Association for the League of Nations: Its development and change), *Hōgaku Kenkyū* (Journal of law, politics, and sociology), Vol. 68, No. 2 (1995), pp. 23-48.
- ²² "Gakugei Kyōryoku Iinkai Setsuritsu Jijō" (On the establishment of the National Committee of Japan on Intellectual Cooperation), no date, the Diplomatic Record Office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan Archives, "Kokusai Renmei Gakugei Kyōryoku Kokusai Iinkai oyobi Kokusai Gakuin Kankei Ikken" (On the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations, and International Institute on Intellectual Cooperation at Paris), Vol. 3.
- ²³ The National Committee of Japan on Intellectual Cooperation, ed., *Gakugei no Kokusai Kyōryoku* (International intellectual cooperation), Tokyo: Japanese Association of the League of Nations, 1928, pp. 18-19.
- ²⁴ Likewise, Yamada Saburo, chairman of the national committee, asserted that "the purpose of our committee is not only to cooperate with the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation, but also to introduce our culture to Western people." Yamada Saburo, "Gakugei Kyōryoku Kokunai Iinkai

- Daihyōsha Kaigi no Gaikyō” (Report on the Convention of National Committees), *Kokusai Chishiki* (International understanding), Vol. 9, No. 11 (1929), p.61.
- 25 For example, Japan, at least officially, always advocated the Chinese campaign for the non-permanent seat of the Council and the member of the ICIC.
 - 26 Since Wu Zhi-Hui never appeared in Geneva during his term (1930-1939), some Chinese intellectuals attended the meetings of the ICIC in his place: Lin Yu-Tang (1931), Chen He-Xi (1932), Hu Tian-Shi (1933-1935), Cheng Qi-Bao (1936), Li Shi-Zeng (1937-1939).
 - 27 The mission was composed of Carl H. Becker (Professor of the University of Berlin, formerly Prussian Minister of Public Education), M. Falski (Director of Primary Education at the Polish Ministry of Public Education), P. Langevin (Professor of the Collège de France), R. H. Tawney (Professor of the London School of Economics and Political Science), Frank P. Walters (Head of the Secretary General’s Office, the League of Nations). The mission was later joined in China by A. Sardi (Representative of the International Institute of Educational Cinematography) and Henri Bonnet (Director of the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation).
 - 28 League of Nations, International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation, *Report of the Committee on the Works of Its Fourteenth Plenary Session submitted to the Council and to the Assembly*, Geneva: League of Nations, 1932, p. 19.
 - 29 The League of Nations’ Mission of Experts, *The Reorganization of Education in China*, Paris: League of Nations’ Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, 1932, p. 197.
 - 30 League of Nations, International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation, “Report of the Committee on the Work of Its Seventeenth Plenary Session,” Geneva, 1935, pp. 7-8.
 - 31 League of Nations, International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation, “Report of the Committee on the Work of Its Eighteenth Plenary Session,” Geneva, 1936, p. 64.
 - 32 Illustrated by Foujita, translated by Kuni Matsuo and Steinilber-Oberlin, *Les Haïkai de Bashō et de ses disciples* (The Haiku of Basho and his disciples), Paris: Institute internationale de coopération intellectuelle, 1936; Masaharu Anesaki, *L’ Art, la vie et la nature au Japon* (Art, life and nature in Japan), Paris: Institute internationale de coopération intellectuelle, 1938; Natsume Sōseki, translated by Horiguchi Daigaku and Georges Bonneau, *Kokoro (Le pauvre cœur des hommes)* (The wretched heart of men), Paris: Institute internationale de coopération intellectuelle, 1939.
 - 33 It eventually led to the “International Act concerning Intellectual Cooperation,” which was prepared by the ICIC with the help of the French government and ratified by 45 countries in 1938. This act stated that the program of the ICIC should be implemented on the basis of national committees and national cultures. “International Act concerning Intellectual Cooperation. Communication from the French government,” December 26, 1938.
 - 34 League of Nations, International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation, “Report by Professor G. de Reynold (Rapporteur) on the Work of the Twentieth Plenary Session of the Committee,” Geneva, August 10, 1938.